



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/600,683

06/20/2003

Erik Olson

13768.373

4994

47973

7590

02/20/2009

WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT  
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER  
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2437

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/20/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/600,683	<b>Applicant(s)</b> OLSON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> JEFFERY WILLIAMS	<b>Art Unit</b> 2437	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 30-37 and 39-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 30-37 and 39-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 June 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

**DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 30 – 37, and 39 – 45 are pending.

All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 1/9/2009 has been entered.

***Specification***

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required:

Newly amended claims 30 – 37, and 39 – 45 comprise the following undisclosed recitations:

1           *“and wherein the HTTP request includes portions where user input is introduced*  
2   *and portions where no user input is introduced” [30], “finding a script construct within a*  
3   *particular HTML element of a portion of the HTTP request where user input is*  
4   *introduced” [30], “wherein the particular HTML element of the portion of the HTTP*  
5   *request where user input is introduced include at least one of:...” [40], “in response to*  
6   *finding the script construct within the particular HTML element”; “further comprising*  
7   *encoding user input to render the script construct inert” [43], and “examining only*  
8   *elements where user input is introduced, including at least the embedded link” [45].*

9   These recitations are not found by the examiner nor shown by the applicant to be  
10 supported within the applicant’s original disclosure.

11           For example, the applicant's original disclosure appears to show support for  
12 examining an HTTP request comprising headers, queries, cookies, and fields. The  
13 entirety of which is examined and disclosed as areas where user input may be  
14 introduced (e.g. fig. 3; par. 26 - 29). There is no disclosure of *“wherein the HTTP*  
15 *request includes portions where user input is introduced and portions where no user*  
16 *input is introduced”* and *“examining only elements where user input is introduced,*  
17 *including at least the embedded link”*.

18           For example, the applicant's original disclosure appears to show support for  
19 examining an HTTP request including headers, queries, cookies, fields of an *HTTP*  
20 *request*, the request answered by an *HTML rendered response*. The examiner notes  
21 that a HTTP request is examined - not HTML elements within the requested response.  
22 The original disclosure reveals no support for the applicant’s recitations such as *“finding*

1 *a script construct within a particular HTML element of a portion of the HTTP request*  
2 *where user input is introduced”.*

3 For example, the applicant’s original disclosure supports the examination of a  
4 *plurality* of HTTP request elements such as *form variables; query string variables; URLs*  
5 *with key value pairs, or headers*. However, there is no disclosure of a *HTML* element  
6 comprising *at least one* of form variables; query string variables; URLs with key value  
7 pairs, or headers. Furthermore, there is no disclosure of a *single* HTML element (as is  
8 effectively claimed – “the particular HTML element”) comprising *at least one* of form  
9 variables; query string variables; URLs with key value pairs, or headers.

10 For example, the applicant’s original disclosure appears to show support for  
11 aborting the processing of a request or, *alternatively*, encoding a request so that a  
12 response may be rendered for the user. The examiner notes that the processing of a  
13 request is either aborted or it is further processed. There is no support for an  
14 embodiment of “*further comprising encoding user input to render the script construct*  
15 *inert*”.

### 17 ***Drawings***

18  
19 The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show  
20 every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the features of the  
21 newly added claims such as “*and wherein the HTTP request includes portions where*  
22 *user input is introduced and portions where no user input is introduced*” [30], “*finding a*

1 *script construct within a particular HTML element of a portion of the HTTP request*  
2 *where user input is introduced” [30], “wherein the particular HTML element of the*  
3 *portion of the HTTP request where user input is introduced include at least one of:...”*  
4 *[40], “in response to finding the script construct within the particular HTML element”;*  
5 *“further comprising encoding user input to render the script construct inert” [43], and*  
6 *“examining only elements where user input is introduced, including at least the*  
7 *embedded link” [45] must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). The*  
8 examiner notes that while the applicant has originally shown the features of an HTTP  
9 request, receiving an HTTP request, and examining the HTTP request, the newly added  
10 recitations such as the above are found lacking within the applicant’s drawings. No new  
11 matter should be entered.

12       Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in  
13 reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended  
14 replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate  
15 prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure  
16 number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as “amended.” If a drawing figure  
17 is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet,  
18 and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate  
19 changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for  
20 consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering  
21 of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an  
22 application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New

Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

**The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:**

*The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.*

**Claims 30 – 37, and 39 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.** The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention (see above objection to the specification). Furthermore, Applicant has not pointed out where the new (or amended) claims are supported, nor does there appear to be a written description of the claim limitations in the application as filed.

1           *The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:*

2           *The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly*  
3           *claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.*

4  
5           **Claims 30 – 37, and 39 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second**  
6           **paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly**  
7           **claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

8           Specifically, claim 30 recites “*and wherein the HTTP request includes portions*  
9           *where user input is introduced and portions where no user input is introduced*”. The  
10          examiner notes that this recitation renders the scope of the claimed invention  
11          indeterminate as it is unclear what portion of user input (i.e. "user request" - see  
12          applicant's specification, e.g. par. 22) comprises *portions where no user input is*  
13          *introduced*. For the purpose of examination, and in harmony with the applicant's  
14          specification (e.g. par. 22), the examiner presumes the applicant to recite “wherein the  
15          HTTP comprises user input”.

16          Specifically, claim 30 recites “*finding a script construct within a particular HTML*  
17          *element of a portion of the HTTP request where user input is introduced*”. The  
18          examiner notes that this recitation renders the scope of the claimed invention  
19          indeterminate as it is unclear how a method for searching an *HTTP request* portion  
20          results in the finding of a script construct *within an HTML element* of a rendered  
21          response (the examiner notes the applicant never recites the examining of the HTML  
22          response). For the purpose of examination, and in harmony with the applicant's



1 specification (e.g. par. 22), the examiner presumes the applicant to recite *"finding a*  
2 *script construct within a particular portion of the HTTP request"* (e.g. par. 22).

3 Specifically, claim 40 recites *"wherein the particular HTML element of the portion*  
4 *of the HTTP request where user input is introduced include at least one of:..."*. The  
5 examiner notes that this recitation renders the scope of the claimed invention  
6 indeterminate as it is unclear how a single HTML element could comprise a plurality of  
7 HTTP request elements. For the purpose of examination, and in harmony with the  
8 applicant's specification, the examiner presumes the applicant to recite *"wherein the*  
9 *particular portion of the HTTP request may be one of:..."*.

10 Specifically claim 45 recites *"examining only elements where user input is*  
11 *introduced, including at least the embedded link"*. The examiner notes that these  
12 recitations render the scope of the claimed invention indeterminate as it is unclear what  
13 should be interpreted as *"only elements where user input is introduced"*. While the  
14 newly added claims appear to further define HTML elements as variables, query strings,  
15 URLs, and headers (ex. claim 40), the examiner notes that such a definition is absent  
16 from the applicant's original disclosure and appears inconsistent with what one of  
17 ordinary skill in the art would regard to be parts of an HTTP request (i.e. HTTP request  
18 elements). For the purpose of examination, the examiner presumes the applicant to  
19 recite *"...HTTP request elements..."*.

20  
21 Depending claims are rejected by virtue of dependency.  
22

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claims 30 – 37, and 39 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Razmov et al. (Razmov), “Practical Automated Filter Generation to Explicitly Enforce Implicit Input Assumptions” in view of CERT Coordination Center (CERT), “Malicious HTML Tags Embedded in Client Web Requests” and “Understanding Malicious Content Mitigation for Web Developers” in view of Fielding et al. (Fielding), RFC 2616.**

Regarding claim 1, Razmov discloses:

*receiving an HTTP request at the web server, the HTTP request having been sent by the user computer and requesting a response* (Razmov; sect. 4, 4:1 – herein prior art discloses sending and receiving HTTP requests, the request being a request for a response from a web server);

Razmov discloses a system that utilizes useful and powerful “filters” for validating requests (i.e. client input) and thus providing security (Razmov, Abstract; sect. 3.2, par. 2). The examiner notes that the Razmov does not appear to explicitly recite that the

1 requested response from the web server is a response *that includes text and HTML*  
2 *elements*.

3 Cert, however, discloses that such request validation is useful for protecting a  
4 system from malicious responses from a web server that comprise dynamically  
5 generated HTML pages (i.e. text and HTML elements) (Cert, pg. 1/8, "Overview"; pg.  
6 2/8, "Malicious code sent...").

7 It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the  
8 system of Razmov was utilized for protecting clients from malicious responses from a  
9 web server that *that includes text and HTML elements*. This would have been obvious  
10 because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to recognize the  
11 teachings of Cert as explicitly directed to by Razmov (Razmov, sect. 3.2, par. 2; pg. 11,  
12 col. 1, "[4]").

13 The combination enables:

14 *And wherein the HTTP request includes portions where user input is introduced*  
15 *and portions where no user input is introduced* (Razmov, sect. 4; Cert, pg. 1/8, sect. 1);  
16 *before dynamic rendering of the HTTP request, using a script module of the*  
17 *server computer to examine the HTTP request for script constructs* (Razmov, fig. 2;  
18 sect. 3.2, par. 2; sect. 4) *identified in an updateable list of markers of active content*  
19 *stored at the web server* (Razmov, sect. 3.2, par. 2; Cert, pg. 2/9, "Identifying the  
20 Special Characters"; Razmov, sect. 4.1, par. 1, bullet 3; pg. 7, col. 2, par. 1; sect. 5.2,  
21 par. 3; ), *wherein examining the HTTP request for script constructs consists of*  
22 *examining the portions of the HTTP request where user input is introduced* (Razmov,

1    sect. 3.1, par. 3 – herein the client request is decomposed into input elements wherein  
2    the input elements are examined);

3            *finding a script construct within a particular HTML element of a portion of the*  
4    *HTTP request where user input is introduced; in response to finding the script construct,*  
5    *generating an error and aborting processing of the HTTP request* (Razmov, sect. 4;  
6    sect. 4.1);

7            The combination enables for input validation and for notifying the user of an error  
8    when the input comprises a script construct. However, the examiner notes that the prior  
9    art does not appear to explicitly recite *informing the user computer that the script*  
10   *construct has been found in the HTTP request and requesting that the user computer*  
11   *resubmit a request.*

12           Fielding discloses that error messages for invalid HTTP requests should inform  
13   and be used such that a user can take corrective measures and resubmit a request  
14   (Fielding, pg. 65, sect. 10.4; pg. 65, sect. 10.4.1; pg. 67, sect. 10.4.10).

15           It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the  
16   teachings of Fielding within the error messages of the prior art combination. This would  
17   have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated  
18   to allow a user to learn and take proactive measures to ensure the safety of his/her  
19   communications. For example, a user could be informed that his HI-IP request, which  
20   was submitted by clicking on a link, was invalid or malicious and would be encouraged  
21   to safely resubmit a subsequent request, such as by manually keying in the correct  
22   URL.

1

2           Regarding claims 31 – 37, the combination enables:

1        *wherein the particular HTML element is an event; wherein the event is an onclick*  
2        *event; wherein the particular HTML element is an expression; wherein the particular*  
3        *HTML element is a value of a name/value pair; wherein the particular HTML element is*  
4        *a value of a tag attribute/value pair; wherein the particular HTML element is an anchor*  
5        *in an href attribute; wherein the particular HTML element is an expression that*  
6        *calculates element size* (Razmov, sect. 4; sect. 4.1, par.; Cert, pg. 1/9, "Problem  
7        Summary", par. 3; pg. 2/9, "Identifying the Special Characters" – herein the prior art  
8        enables for all input elements to be examined for script constructs).

9  
10       Regarding claims 39 – 41, the combination enables:  
11       *wherein receiving the HTTP request includes receiving and examining each of: a*  
12       *query string; a field of an HTTP form; and a header; wherein the particular HTML*  
13       *element of the portion of the HTTP request where user input is introduced include at*  
14       *least one of: form variables; query string variables; URLs with key value pairs; or*  
15       *headers; in response to finding the script construct within the particular HTML element,*  
16       *generating an error event and logging the error event for administrative review; wherein*  
17       *the error event is logged for administrative review* (Razmov, fig. 3; sect. 4, 4.1; Cert, pg.  
18       1/9, "Mitigation Summary" - herein the prior art enables for all input elements to be  
19       examined for script constructs and logging errors).

20  
21       Regarding claim 43, the combination enables:

*encoding user input to render the script construct inert* (Cert, pg. 2/9, "Encoding Dynamic Output Elements").

Regarding claims 44 and 45, they comprise essentially similar limitations, and they are rejected, at least, for the same reasons. Furthermore, the combination enables for client requests to result from malicious embedded links (Cert, pg. 2/8, "Malicious code sent..."). Additionally, the combination enables for the examination of HTTP requests, comprising the examination of user input and of links contained within HTTP requests (Razmov, pg. 2, col. 1, par. 2,3; fig. 1; Cert, pg. 2/8, "Malicious code sent...").

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/9/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues or asserts essentially that:

(i) *With respect to the objection to the specification based on "finding a script construct within a particular HTML element" Applicant respectfully traverses. In particular, ¶ 29 of the originally filed application notes that "[t]he present invention not only searches for typical script constructs such as angle brackets, but also for script*

1 *constructs or markers of active content that are only harmful when rendered inside of*  
2 *particular HTML elements." The obvious consequence, as noted in the same paragraph,*  
3 *when such a script construct is present, it is found within that particular HTML element.*  
4 (Remarks, pg. 8)

5  
6 In response, the examiner respectfully notes that it appears that the applicant  
7 has misinterpreted the applicant's disclosure. The examiner notes, as is known by  
8 those of ordinary skill in the art and is disclosed within the applicant's invention (e.g.  
9 par. 20 - 22) that an *HTTP request* may comprise a malicious script construct. When  
10 this request is served to the user, the script is rendered within the HTML page sent to  
11 the user.

12 The examiner respectfully notes that the paragraph cited by the applicant merely  
13 supports the idea that scripts may be rendered within HTML elements of a served  
14 response. However, the above cited portion does not support finding a script construct  
15 within a particular HTML element (e.g. vs. the finding of a script construct within a user  
16 request).

17  
18 (ii) *With respect to the objection to the specification based on "further comprising*  
19 *encoding user input to render the script construct inert", Applicant notes that the*  
20 *specification has been amended. Specifically, ¶ 7 has been amended to include a direct*  
21 *reference to the rendering of the script inert. No new matter is introduced as such was*  
22 *expressly included in at least claim 15 of the originally filed application.*



1        *With respect to objections based on "further comprising encoding user input to*  
2        *render the script construct inert" and "examining only the request for dynamic content in*  
3        *the form of the embedded link and other HTML elements where user input is*  
4        *introduced." As neither phrase is found in the amended claims, the objection is therefore*  
5        *moot. (Remarks, pg. 9)*

6  
7        In response, the examiner respectfully notes that it would appear improper to  
8        consider the objection in question as moot since the claim 43 still recites *"further*  
9        *comprising encoding user input to render the script construct inert"*.

10       Furthermore, the examiner notes that while the original claim 15 recited encoding  
11       to render a script inert, the applicant's original disclosure, including original claim 15,  
12       does not such support the contradictory recitations of both aborting the processing of  
13       the HTTP request and encoding the HTTP request.

14  
15       (iii)    *With respect to the objection to the drawings, Applicant respectfully traverses. In*  
16       *particular, while 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) notes that drawings must show every feature of the*  
17       *invention specified in the claims, 37 C.F.R. § 1.81(a) also notes that drawings need only*  
18       *be submitted where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be*  
19       *patented. Applicant respectfully submits that inasmuch as 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and 37*  
20       *C.F.R. § 1.81(a) are therefore in conflict, the only requirement is that when drawings are*  
21       *necessary to understand the subject matter sought, they must include every feature of*  
22       *the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that no such requirement is necessary here*

1 *as one skilled in the art could easily understand the subject matter of the pending claims*  
2 *even without additional or amended drawings. (Remarks, pg. 9)*

3  
4 In response, the examiner respectfully notes, as is pointed out within the above  
5 objections and rejections to the specification and claims, the applicant's claimed  
6 features are not found to be disclosed within the applicant's original disclosure and are  
7 even recited contrary to the originally disclosed invention. Therefore, the examiner  
8 respectfully points out that drawings showing these features of the amended claims are  
9 appropriately required.

10  
11 (iv) *In this regard, Applicant notes that the Office only generally alleges "Applicant*  
12 *has not pointed out where the new (or amended) claim is supported, nor does there*  
13 *appear to be a written description of the claim limitations in the application as filed."*  
14 *Such an assertion is clear error. In particular, Applicant's prior response specifically*  
15 *pointed out where the new claims were supported. Indeed, the prior response pointed to*  
16 *support in paragraphs 7, 8, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22, 24-28, 30 and 31 or the originally filed*  
17 *application, as well as in the original claims and figures. As Applicant expressly pointed*  
18 *out the support, the Office's general allegation is therefore insufficient to provide the*  
19 *specific reasons why one skilled in the art would not have recognized Applicant*  
20 *possessed the claimed invention. (Remarks, pg. 10)*

1           In response, the examiner respectfully points out that the applicant has failed to  
2 show support for the various amendments made to the claims. It is noted that a general  
3 statement directing the examiner to review the applicant's specification fails to  
4 specifically point out the support for the claim amendments as required. It is also noted  
5 that the examiner, as part of the examination process, has carefully considered the  
6 applicant's disclosure and the examiner has clearly articulated the reasons as to why  
7 the applicant's original disclosure fails to support the amended recitations. Thus, the  
8 examiner properly notes that the applicant has not pointed out where the new (or  
9 amended) claim is supported, nor does there appear to be a written description of the  
10 claim limitations in the application as filed (see above objection to the specification).

11  
12 (v)     ... *In contrast, the pending claims recite a system in which an HTTP request is*  
13 *examined for script constructs by examining only the portions of the request where user*  
14 *input is introduced. Such recitation is evident inasmuch as the claims recite that*  
15 *examining consists of examining those portions where user input is introduced. As*  
16 *Razmov thus teaches to apply the filter to all input, without regard to whether input is*  
17 *user input, it therefore teaches away from the recited invention which examines only*  
18 *portions where user input is introduced.*

19           *Furthermore, when Razmov is combined with the other art of record, there is no*  
20 *teaching or reasonable support for contradicting the teachings of Razmov and testing*  
21 *only user input. (Remarks, pg. 12)*

22

1           In response, the examiner respectfully notes that the applicant's arguments fail to  
2   comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the  
3   claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language  
4   of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. The applicant appears  
5   to allege that *examining those portions where user input is introduced* is equivalent to  
6   *examining only the portions of the request where user input is introduced*. However,  
7   such an assertion is neither supported by evidence or backed by rational. As the  
8   examiner finds no apparent reason as to how such an equivalency exists, the examiner  
9   respectfully notes that the applicant's assertion is unpersuasive.

10           Furthermore, regarding the prior art, the examiner respectfully notes that the prior  
11   art combination reveals a web server that processes a HTTP request given by a user  
12   (i.e. the web server examines "user input"). Accordingly, it appears that it may be said  
13   the prior art enables examining "only" user input (Razmov, pg. 2, col. 1, par. 2,3; fig. 1;  
14   Cert, pg. 2/8, "Malicious code sent...").

15           Finally, the examiner respectfully notes that in response to applicant's argument  
16   that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that  
17   the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., *testing only user input*) are not recited in  
18   the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification,  
19   limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988  
20   F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

21

22

**Conclusion**

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

***See Notice of References Cited.***

A shortened statutory period for reply is set to expire **3** months (not less than 90 days) from the mailing date of this communication.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffery Williams whose telephone number is (571) 272-7965. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

1

2

3 J. Williams

4 AU 2437

5

6 /Emmanuel L. Moise/

7 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437

8

9